

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 1,3,5-11, 13-14, 16-19, 21-25, 27, 29-32 are pending. Claims 2, 4,12, 15, 20, 26, 28 are cancelled.

Making Final

Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The claim amendments regarding -- '*home directory of the terminating file transfer server*' -- do not overcome the disclosure by the prior art as shown below.

The Examiner is maintaining the rejection(s) using the same grounds for rejection and thus making this action FINAL.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/2009 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the Objection to Specification, the Applicant presents the following argument(s) [*in italics*]:

Applicants point to FIG. 1B which shows a host computer having a processor 175. The host computer in FIG. 1B represents the host computer 105a and 105b of FIG. 1A.... As such, "a file transfer server having a processor" language in claims 1 and 19 is

clearly supported by the present application. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

The Applicant Specifications Figure 1b indicate a host computer with a processor 175 . However said processor 175 is clearly indicated as separate and distinct from said file transfer server 'Connect:Direct Server', thus the server cannot be described as having a processor.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

...Persels requires an eDIRECT client to establish a local presence of the client on eFORWARD Server to initiate delivery of a file...

... Hashem requires a host having an internal inbasket to establish a local presence of the host having the internal inbasket with a host having an external outbasket before the host having the internal inbasket can download a file from the outbasket of the other host. As such, Hashem individually or in combination with Persels fails to teach or suggest at least "... without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as recited in claim 10.

The Applicant argument appears to imply that, in context of implementing the file transfer, the process of the remote client computer establishing a file transfer session with the said server inherently requires a remote user logging on to the terminating file transfer server. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

Persels is not relied upon to disclose 'transferring data *without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server*'.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Hashem disclosed *allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating a local presence of the remote host on the terminating file transfer server.* (Hashem-Column 5 Lines 25-55)

Hashem automatically download files to the destination user without requiring the destination user to login to the terminal file server.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [*in italics*]:

Persels does not disclose that a configuration file residing in a home directory comprises a host name and port name of the remote host where a file is transferred.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

Persels Column 2 Lines 55-66 disclosed a pre-assigned port for implementing the transfer protocol. Persels Column 7 Lines 15-20 also disclosed wherein

administrative/operational data pertaining to the iBoxes are kept in the forwarding database. Where the iBoxes are interpreted as the home directory it would have been obvious for Persels to include the pre-assigned port and IP address information of the remote host (the *eDIRECT client*) as part of the administrative/operational data for each iBox.

The Examiner notes that the database containing the administrative/operational data for each iBox is equivalent to *a configuration file residing in a home directory*.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [*in italics*]:

... Hashem *does not disclose the further act of transferring the file in accordance with a configuration file residing in the respective inbasket.*

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Examiner notes that the limitation regarding *transferring the file in accordance with a configuration file* is referring to a terminating file transfer server.

Hashem is not relied upon to disclose a terminating file transfer server *transferring the file in accordance with a configuration file residing in a home directory.*

Persels disclosed (re. Claim 1) a terminating file transfer server having a processor (Persels-Column 4 Lines 40-50, 'eFORWARD Server') operable to receive a file transfer message from an originating file transfer server, the file transfer message including details (Persels-Column 5 Lines 55-65, 'specify a partner to receive a message and, optionally, a process that is requested to be executed by the receiving partner's host on receipt of a message') about the transfer including a local user and at least one filename;

the terminating file transfer server in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent,

an agent (Persels-Column 4 Lines 40-50, 'transfer protocol engine') operable to read the file transfer message, and direct the transfer of at least one file (Persels-Column 8 Lines 10-20) associated with said at least one filename to a home directory (Persels-Column 5 Lines 50-60, 'partner iBOX to receive message') associated with the local user;

and a configuration file residing in the home directory, (Persels-Column 7 Lines 10-20, 'administrative details pertaining to iBOX') and operable to instruct the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, (Persels-Column 6 Lines 15-20, 'the message is retained in the eFORWARD server database') transfer said at least one file to a remote host.

Persels disclosed delivering a data transfer file to its destination according to a pre-assigned port number. Persels disclosed operational information found on a database. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, '*specified IP address and listening port*', Column 7 Lines 35-55, '*operational data*') Persels further disclosed that to complete the data transfer the destination host name (Persels-Column 8 Lines 20-30) and port number must be specified. (Persels-Column 9 Lines 45-55)

Persels Column 2 Lines 55-66 disclosed a pre-assigned port for implementing the transfer protocol. Persels Column 7 Lines 15-20 also disclosed wherein administrative/operational data pertaining to the iBoxes are kept in the forwarding database. Where the iBoxes are interpreted as the home directory it would have been obvious for Persels to include the pre-assigned port and IP address information of the remote host (the *eDIRECT client*) as part of the administrative/operational data for each iBox.

The Examiner notes that the database containing the administrative/operational data for each iBox is equivalent to *a configuration file residing in a home directory*.

Thus Persels disclosed a terminating file transfer server *transferring the file in accordance with a configuration file residing in a home directory*.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

Applicant respectfully traverses this finding of well-known features as described in Claim 23.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. At the time of the invention the renaming of downloaded files were well-known in the networking art, as evidenced by Campbell US Publication 2005/0086298, Paragraph 254-257, Paragraph 272.

Priority

The effective date of the claims described in this application is November 12,2003.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Claims 1, 19 recite *a file transfer server having a processor.*

The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description.

The Applicant Specifications Figure 1b indicate a host computer with a processor 175 . However said processor 175 is clearly indicated as separate and distinct from said file transfer server 'Connect:Direct Server'.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3,5-11, 13-14, 16-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27,29-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Persels (US Patent 7065547) in view of Hashem (US Patent 7155578).

Persels disclosed (re. Claim 1) a file handling system, comprising: a terminating file transfer server having a processor (Persels-Column 4 Lines 40-50, '*eFORWARD Server*') operable to receive a file transfer message from an originating file transfer server, the file transfer message including details (Persels-Column 5 Lines 55-65, '*specify a partner to receive a message and, optionally, a process that is requested to be executed by the receiving partner's host on receipt of a message*') about the transfer including a local user and at least one filename;

the terminating file transfer server in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent,

an agent (Persels-Column 4 Lines 40-50, '*transfer protocol engine*') operable to read the file transfer message, and direct the transfer of at least one file (Persels-Column 8 Lines 10-20) associated with said at least one filename to a home directory (Persels-Column 5 Lines 50-60, '*partner iBOX to receive message*') associated with the local user;

and a configuration file residing in the home directory *of the terminating file transfer server,* (Persels-Column 7 Lines 10-20, '*administrative details pertaining to iBOX*') and operable to instruct the agent to, *after saving the at least one file to the home directory,* (Persels-Column 6 Lines 15-20, '*the message is retained in the eFORWARD server database*') transfer said at least one file to a remote host.

Persels disclosed delivering a data transfer file to its destination according to a pre-assigned port number. Persels disclosed operational information found on a

database. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, '*specified IP address and listening port*', Column 7 Lines 35-55, '*operational data*') Persels further disclosed that to complete the data transfer the destination host name (Persels-Column 8 Lines 20-30) and port number must be specified. (Persels-Column 9 Lines 45-55)

Persels Column 2 Lines 55-66 disclosed a pre-assigned port for implementing the transfer protocol. Persels Column 7 Lines 15-20 also disclosed wherein administrative/operational data pertaining to the iBoxes are kept in the forwarding database. Where the iBoxes are interpreted as the home directory it would have been obvious for Persels to include the pre-assigned port and IP address information of the remote host (the *eDIRECT client*) as part of the administrative/operational data for each iBox.

The Examiner notes that the database containing the administrative/operational data for each iBox is equivalent to *a configuration file residing in a home directory*.

However Persels did not disclose the agent further configured to transfer the at least one filename in accordance with instructions from a configuration file residing in the home directory wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote host *thereby allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server.*

For purposes of examination the Examiner interprets said '*local presence*' as a remote user logged on into the terminating file transfer server.

Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 1) an agent further configured to transfer the at least one filename in accordance with instructions from a configuration file residing in the home directory wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote host (Hashem-Column 11 Lines 30-55, Column 12 Lines 5-55) thereby allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server. (Hashem-Column 5 Lines 25-55)

Hashem automatically download files to the destination user without requiring the destination user to login to the terminal file server.

Persels and Hashem are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding data transfer file handling using transfer agents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the networking art to combine Hashem into Persels. The motivation for said combination would have been to provide data transfer processing with limited manual intervention. (Hashem-Column 3 Lines 40-55)

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 3,13) wherein the remote host (Persels-Column 6 Lines 20-25, 'iBOX DIRECT client') is associated with the local user. (Persels-

Column 7 Lines 10-15, *'allow user to create iBOX')*

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 3,13.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 14) wherein the originating file transfer server is operable to instruct the agent to execute upon receiving a file transfer message. (Persels-Column 5 Lines 55-65, *'specify a partner to receive a message and, optionally, a process that is requested to be executed by the receiving partner's host on receipt of a message')*

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 14.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 5) wherein the agent is further operable to transmit said at least one file to the remote host. (Persels-Column 9 Lines 10-20, *'If a destination client responds, then the message is immediately delivered and so marked in the eFORWARD Server database '*)

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 5.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 6,11) wherein the agent is further operable to delete said at least one file from the home directory in accordance with the configuration file. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 25-35, '*message will be deleted once the retain period is over*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 6,11.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 7) wherein the terminating file transfer server is a Connect:Direct server. (Persels-Column 4 Lines 40-50, '*eFORWARD Server*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 7.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 8) a port monitor at the remote terminal operable to monitor communications to the remote host on a port specified by the configuration file. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, '*listening port*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 8.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 9) further comprising means for monitoring a port of the remote host for communications from the agent. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, *'listening port'*)

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 9.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 10) a method of handling files on a Connect:Direct server, (Persels-Column 4 Lines 40-50, *'eFORWARD Server'*) comprising the steps of: receiving a file transfer message (Persels-Column 5 Lines 55-65, *'specify a partner to receive a message and, optionally, a process that is requested to be executed by the receiving partner's host on receipt of a message'*) from an originating file transfer server; determining a home directory (Persels-Column 5 Lines 50-60, *'partner iBOX to receive message'*) from a local user associated with the file transfer message; storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory; (Persels-Column 5 Lines 60-65, *'incoming message is preferably accepted and stored in the database 24 for forwarding'*) retrieving a configuration file from the home directory; and transmitting said at least one file responsive to the configuration file.

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 10.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 11) wherein the method further comprises: responsive to the configuration file, removing the message from the home directory. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 25-35, '*message will be deleted once the retain period is over*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 11.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 14) further comprising using an agent program to direct the transfer of said at least one file to the home directory. (Persels-Column 5 Lines 60-65, '*incoming message is preferably accepted and stored in the database 24 for forwarding*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 14.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 16) using a Connect:Direct server to receive the file transfer message. (Persels-Column 4 Lines 40-50, '*eFORWARD Server*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 16.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 17) monitoring a port at a remote terminal specified by the configuration file. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, '*specified IP address and listening port*', Column 7 Lines 35-40, '*operational data*')

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 17.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 18) receiving said at least one file at the port specified by the configuration file. (Persels-Column 9 Lines 45-55)

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 18.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 19) a Connect:Direct file handling system, comprising: a terminating file transfer server; an agent; and a configuration file; the terminating file transfer server being operable launch the agent upon receipt of a file transfer message, the file transfer message comprising a local and at least one filename, username (Persels-Column 8 Lines 5-20) and the agent being operable to direct the transfer of at least one file associated with the filename to a home directory associated with the username, the agent being further operable to read the configuration file, (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, '*specified IP address and listening*

port', Column 7 Lines 35-40, *'operational data'*) and transfer said at least one file to a remote host specified by the configuration file.

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 19.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 21), wherein the agent is operable to remove said at least one file from the home directory after transferring said at least one file to the remote host. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 25-35, *'message will be deleted once the retain period is over'*)

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 21.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 22) a port monitor at a remote host, the port monitor being operable to monitor a port specified in the configuration file (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, *'specified IP address and listening port'*)

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 22.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 24) a computer readable medium having a program for handling files on a Connect:Direct server, the program operable to perform the steps of: receiving a file transfer message from an originating file transfer server; determining a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message; storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory; retrieving a configuration file from the home directory; and transmitting said at least one file responsive to the configuration file. (See Claims 1,10)

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 24.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 25) the program further operable to perform the step of: responsive to the configuration file, removing the message from the home directory. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 25-35, 'message will be deleted once the retain period is over')

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 25.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 27) wherein the remote host is associated

Art Unit: 2444

with the local user. (Persels-Column 7 Lines 10-15, '*allow user to create iBOX*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 27.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 29) using an agent program to transmit said at least one file responsive to the configuration file. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, '*specified IP address and listening port*', Column 7 Lines 35-40, '*operational data*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 29.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 30) using a Connect:Direct server to receive the file transfer message. (Persels-Column 4 Lines 40-50, '*eFORWARD Server*'))

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 30.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 31) monitoring a port at a remote host specified by the configuration file. . (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, '*specified IP*')

address and listening port', Column 7 Lines 35-40, 'operational data')

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 31.

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 32) receiving said at least one file at the port specified by the configuration file. (Persels-Column 6 Lines 10-15, *'specified IP address and listening port', Column 7 Lines 35-40, 'operational data'*)

The motivation to combine described in Claim 1 applies to Claims 32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Persels (US Patent 7065547) in view of in view of Hashem (US Patent 7155578) in view of Campbell (US Publication 2005/0086298).

Persels-Hashem disclosed (re. Claim 23) a file processor located at the remote terminal, the file processor being operable to receive files via the port monitor. (Persels-Column 9 Lines 10-20, '*If a destination client responds, then the message is immediately delivered and so marked in the eFORWARD Server database*')

While Persels-Hashem substantially disclosed the claimed invention Persels-Hashem did not disclose (re. Claim 23) the file processor being operable to assign said at least one filename to said at least one file received, respectively.

Campbell disclosed (re. Claim 23) the file processor being operable to assign said at least one filename to said at least one file received, respectively. (Campbell-Paragraph 254-257, Paragraph 272)

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to incorporate the rename function by Campbell into the system and method by Persels-Hashem. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable the recipient user to indicate a preferred (e.g. more easily remembered) file name.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Bengzon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3944. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571)272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/Yemane Mesfin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2444

